

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,336	12/18/2001	Alexander Von Gaisberg	4223/PCT	8727
21553 75	590 04/20/2004		EXAMINER	
FASSE PATENT ATTORNEYS, P.A.			ROJAS, BERNARD	
P.O. BOX 726	ИЕ 04444-0726		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
HAMPDEN, N	/IE 04444-0720		2832	
			DATE MAILED: 04/20/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	- un			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/019,336	GAISBERG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	- ,			
	Bernard Rojas	2832				
The MAILING DATE of this communicati Period for Reply	ion appears on the cover sheet wit	th the corr spondenc addr	ss			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA* - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica* - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, It Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reation. ys, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT by statute, cause the application to become AB.	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. FHS from the mailing date of this commandone ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n <u>28 February 2003</u> .					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL. 2b)[☐ This action is non-final.					
•	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the applied 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) ☐ Claim(s) 11-20 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction.	rithdrawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Ex 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on <u>18 December 20</u> Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by	$\frac{101}{100}$ is/are: a) $\boxed{00}$ accepted or b) $\boxed{00}$ to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan correction is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR	1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority doc 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority doc 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International * See the attached detailed Office action for	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in A ne priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Sta	age			
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date				
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12182001 12242003. 	~ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	formal Patent Application (PTO-15	52)			

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 08/28/2003 have been fully considered but they are

not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain

features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies

(i.e., obtaining springs with equal total spring energy) are not recited in the rejected

claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from

the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26

USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant has not claimed any specific structure for pre-stressing the springs;

applicant merely claims the spring is pre-stressed. Tsuzuki et al. discloses that that the

same energy is stored in both springs when they are in the neutral position due to pre-

stressing [col. 4 lines 52-55].

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed 12/18/2001 fails to comply with 37

CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it

is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most

knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in

the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information

referred to therein has not been considered.

Art Unit: 2832

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsuzuki et al.

Regarding claim 1, an electromagnetic actuator [see figure 1] with two electromagnets [51, 52] arranged at a spacing distance to on another. An armature [6] that is moveable between the electromagnets against the force of two springs [21, 22]. The two springs are pre-stressed in such a manor to store the same amount of energy [col. 4 lines 52-55].

Regarding claim 2, at least one of the springs is nonlinear [col. 2 lines 40-46] therefore; it has a non-linear characteristic curve.

Regarding claim 3, the spring characteristic curve of at least one of the springs comprises a maximum value at a position when the armature is spaced away from the two electromagnets [col. 4 lines 52-55].

Claims 1, 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schmitz.

Regarding claim 1, an electromagnetic actuator [see figure 1] with two electromagnets [3, 4] arranged at a spacing distance to on another. An armature [5] that is moveable between the electromagnets against the force of two springs [7, 8].

The two springs are pre-stressed in such a manor to store the same amount of energy [col. 3 lines 58-67].

Regarding claim 8, a setting means [2.1] for setting the pre-stressing of the spring [7] is provided [col. 4 lines 1-7].

Regarding claim 7, same as claims 1 and 8 previously discussed in this office action. The method is inherent in the product structure.

Regarding claim 9, measuring means [col. 6 lines 16-29] for measuring the progressions of the spring forces are provided.

Regarding claim 10, control means [9, figure 1] for controlling the setting means [col. 6 lines 16-29].

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 11-20 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record does not teach, nor suggest, in the claimed combination an electromagnetic actuator wherein two springs are pre-stressed so that the same total spring energy is stored in each one of the two springs when the springs are respectively maximally compressed through a spring travel by moving the armature through the spacing distance between the two electromagnets.

Art Unit: 2832

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bernard Rojas whose telephone number is (571) 272-1998. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:00), every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Elvin G. Enad can be reached on (571) 272-1990. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/019,336

Art Unit: 2832

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Br